DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 323 CS 211 378

AUTHOR Salwen, Michael B.; Garrison, Bruce
TITLE What Is Newsworthy and What Is Not? A Comparison of U.S. and Latin American Gatekeepers.
PUB DATE May 88
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (38th, New Orleans, LA, May 29-June 2, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Cross Cultural Studies; *Editors; Foreign Countries; *Freedom of Speech; Journalism; Mass Media Role; *Press Opinion; Social Problems; World Affairs; *World Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Agenda Setting; Development Journalism; *Gatekeeper Role; Journalists; Latin America; Media Government Relationship; News Values

ABSTRACT

Since gatekeepers have the ability to inform the public about international affairs, it is important to understand gatekeepers' news values and perceptions of the role of the press in society. A study hypothesized that these problems could be subsumed under two dimensions, freedom of the press and development. In a mail survey, subjects, 118 United States and 17 Latin American editors, evaluated the importance of a list of world press problems. Results showed (1) both the United States and Latin American editors believed that a press free of government pressure was important; (2) Latin American editors were more supportive of the developmental concept of the press than the United States editors; and (3) United States and Latin American editors showed no differences in their evaluations of news coverage of and by developing nations. Results suggest that despite the possibility that the two groups of editors would interpret the developmental concept differently, there was a surprising degree of agreement. (Two tables of data are included, and 66 references are appended.) (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297323

WHAT IS NEWSWORTHY AND WHAT IS NOT?

A COMPARISON OF U.S. AND LATIN AMERICAN GATEKEEPERS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Salwen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By

Michael B. Salwen

and

Bruce Garrison

Paper presented to the International Communication Association, Intercultural and Development Communication Division, New Orleans, May 1988.

The authors are assistant and associate professors, respectively, in the School of Communication, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida. They gratefully acknowledge the School's assistance in providing funding for this project.

CS211378

ABSTRACT

What is Newsworthy and What is Not?

A Comparison of U.S. and Latin American Gatekeepers

By

Michael B. Salwen and Bruce Garrison

University of Miami, School of Communication

Coral Gables, FL 33124

This study surveyed U.S. and Latin American editors and assessed their evaluations of world press problems to understand their perceptions of news values and press functions. It was hypothesized that these problems could be subsumed under two dimensions -- freedom of the press and development. According to the freedom of the press notion, the press should be independent from government to publicly expose social problems. According to the development notion, the press should actively work with the government to resolve pressing social problems. Editors were asked to evaluate a long list of world press problems. A factor analytic solution to these problems revealed the two hypothesized dimensions and two other dimensions -- news of developing nations and training needs. No differences were found in the freedom of the press and news of developing nations dimensions. However, Latin American editors evaluated development and training problems as more important than U.S. editors.

What is Newsworthy and What is Not?

A Comparison of U.S. and Latin American Gatekeepers

More than 60 years ago, Lippmann (1922, pp. 3-32) argued that the mass media create the "pictures in our heads," mapping for the public a world beyond sensory experiences. This "mapping" process involves the gatekeeping and agenda-setting functions (Atwood & Bullion, 1982; Rogers, in press). Gatekeepers select the day's news and, as a consequence, the public forms an agenda of issue priorities. News media coverage of international affairs is likely to show such an agenda-setting effect. Most people's knowledge about international affairs is likely to be learned largely from the news media. Since gatekeepers have the ability to inform the public about international affairs, it is important to understand gatekeepers' news values and perceptions of the role of the press in society.

Most international communication research investigating the mapping process has employed content analysis (Atwood & Bullion, 1982, p. 102). These content analyses have described, among other things, how the Western news media concentrate their coverage on elite nations and issues and overlook the developing world or portray it in a negative fashion (Adams, 1986; Budd, 1964; Gaddy & Tanjong, 1986; Gerbner & Marvanyi, 1984; Hart, 1963; Hester, 1971, 1974; Kaplan, 1979; Reyes Matta, 1979; Semmel, 1976). The conclusion drawn by Semmel (1976) was typical: "The image of the global system presented by the prestige U.S. press is basically Eurocentric, big-power dominant, and Western-oriented. In this news map of the world, only a few countries are important or deemed to be of interest; those societies outside the mainstream of prevailing American world perspectives receive minimal attention or no attention at all" (p. 731).

This study surveyed U.S. and Latin American editors and assessed their evaluations of world press problems in order to understand underlying news values and perceptions of press functions. Gatekeeping research has attempted to locate the psychological and situational constraints that lead journalists to select certain news stories over others (Stone, 1987, pp. 54-57). The research has found that the selection may be idiosyncratic (Snider, 1967, White, 1950) and mechanical, reflecting the news wires' (Breed, 1955; Cutlip, 1954; Garrison, 1980; Gieber, 1956; Gold & Simmons, 1965; Riffe, Ellis, Rogers, Van Ommeren, & Woodman, 1986; Whitney & Becker, 1982) or government officials' agendas (Sigel, 1973, p. 124). Another consistent finding in gatekeeping research involves the standardization of news, resulting in a homogeneous "news mix" (Breed, 1955; Riffe, Ellis, Rogers, Van Ommeren, & Woodman, 1986; Stempel, 1985). Stempel (1985) attributed this high degree of standardization to the "general notion as to what makes a suitable news package . . . similar to the general notion that nutrition experts have as to what makes up a suitable diet (e.g, the four food groups) (p. 815)."

McQuail (1984, p. 142), building on the work of Galtung and Ruge (1965), suggested that consensus regarding three factors -- organizational, genre-related, and socio-cultural -- might account for the high degree of standardization in the news. McQuail (p. 142) observed that although Galtung and Ruge's model has been widely used to generate hypotheses involving the selection of foreign news, which is likely to involve socio-cultural characteristics, the socio-cultural factor received the least elaboration in the Galtung and Ruge model (see also Peterson, 1979, p. 118). Galtung and Ruge argued that news values involve criteria which include frequency, threshold, unambiguity, meaningfulness, consonance, unexpectedness, elitism, personalization, and negativity. The more

criteria an event contains the more likely it is to be selected by gatekeepers. The criteria may be predictable and systematic within cultures but vary among cultures.

Research on the professional socialization of journalists also offers a framework for understanding socio-cultural differences in news selection. There exists some debate whether journalists are socialized into reporting the news within narrow cultural perspectives, and if so, to what extent (Altheide, 1984). As a result of journalistic socialization, this notion maintains, Western journalists learn certain news values and the function of the press in society. They may see themselves as "relatively autonomous from government and will profess some variant of the 'fourth estate' ('adversary' or 'watchdog') ideology" (Bullion 1983, p. 183). While less is known about Third World journalists' news values, some formulations of the "developmental concept" of the press suggest that that Third World journalists put less emphasis on the adversarial role of the press than Western journalists. They may even see themselves as working with the state to resolve pressing social problems (Encanto, 1982; Ogunade, 1973).

Early research on foreign journalists covering the United States described their demographic characteristics and their perceptions of control over their communication (Lambert, 1956; Mowlana, 1975). Chaudhary (1974) compared small availability samples of American and Indian journalists for their evaluations of standard textbook criteria of newsworthiness and found differences in their evaluations of proximity and conflict. In one of the few attempts to conduct a large-scale comparative international gatekeeping study, Ghorpade (1984) surveyed Third World and Western-based correspondents in Washington, D.C., to determine what they regarded as the most important world press problems. Ghorpade found that Third World correspondents were

significantly more likely to agree with statements concerning Western domination of news flow, biased reports about the Third World, and Western control of news transmission hardware than Western correspondents. Both groups of correspondents, however, agreed that the Western press ignores the Third World and that government interference with freedom of the press is a serious world press problem. There was also no difference between the two groups of correspondents concerning poor access to Third World news sources, need to upgrade Third World media hardware, and training for Third World journalists. The Ghorpade study highlights the fact that Western and Third World journalists may hold different news values and perceptions of press functions, even though they agree in some key areas.

The Ghorpode study also highlights the fact that there is no clearly agreed upon agenda as to the most important world press problems. There is also no shortage of world press problems. Masmoudi's (1978) seminal UNESCO document that was instrumental in publicizing Third World grievances against the Western press outlined a long list of complaints. Despite what at first blush appears to be a long agenda of world press problems, we believe these problems can be subsumed under two broad dimensions -- "freedom of the press" and "development."

The term freedom of the press was selected to describe the Western dimension because, as Jeffres (1986) has observed, "Western countries see themselves as the depositories of freedom and liberty" (p. 329). According to this notion, the press should be independent from government to publicy expose problems so the problems can be addressed and resolved (Weaver, Buddenbaum, & Fair, 1985). The United States has historically led the "international crusade" for freedom of the press in what has come to be known as the "free-flow" doctrine (Blanchard, 1983; Renaud, 1985). Critics of this doctrine see a "one-way" or "imbalanced" flow because of the

technological and economic dominance of the Western news media to monopolize the flow.

The second dimension being posited is development. The developmental concept of the press, manifested in the form of development journalism, has been largely conceived by Third World scholars and governments (Encanto, 1982). Development journalism offers itself as an alternative to the Western notion. The developmental concept conceives of the press as actively involved in promoting "nation-building" in newly independent countries, an appealing proposition to nations with poorly developed infrastructures. The concept, which has yet to be fully conceptualized, may or may not involve the rejection of Western news values. Weaver, Buddenbaum and Fair (1985) summarized what many media professionals and scholars believe constitutes the Third World press' view toward the Western concept: "Many Third World spokespersons have come to believe that a free press is a luxury that they cannot afford and can do without for the time being. Their explanation is that, given the conditions of scarce resources, a colonial legacy . . . and a subservient position in the world economic and information systems, a free press can too easily lead to an inability of government to function and to internal chaos" (pp. 104-105).

However, there is no clear agreement concerning what constitutes the developmental concept. Hachten (1981) described the developmental concept as "an amorphous and curious mixture of ideas, rhetoric, influences, and grievances" (p. 72). Under some formulations the developmental concept contains "aspects straight out of Lenin and the Communist concept of the press," (p. 72) while some proponents of this concept, such as Narinder K. Aggarwala (1978), of the United Nations Development Program, describe development journalism as similar to Western-style investigative reporting of developmental problems.

Whatever the developmental concept actually entails, or will entail when the concept is more clearly conceptualized, it is clear that it has come to be viewed in some quarters as contrary to the Western concept. While those in the developing world accuse the Western media of quantitatively and qualitatively bad coverage of the Third World, Western media practitioners accuse their Third World colleagues of using the press as government propaganda instruments (McDaniel, 1986; Righter, 1979; Sussman, 1978). Debates between Western and Third World scholars and journalists over the alleged licensing of journalists and charges of cabals by Third World leaders to conspire to subvert freedom of the press on a worldwide scale have also aggravated tensions between the Western and Third World camps (Altschull, 1984, pp. 207-251; Holmberg, 1987).

Hypotheses

As a result of this discussion pointing to the freedom-of-the-press/development dichotomy as underlying dimensions reflecting news values and perceived press functions, we tested the following hypotheses:

(1) "Freedom of the press" and "development" will be two underlying dimensions of the gatekeeping process among U.S. and Latin American editors;

(2) U.S. editors will regard freedom of the press as a more important world press problem than Latin American editors;

(3) Latin American editors will regard development as a more important world press problem than U.S. editors.

Method

A cross-national comparison of the news values and press functions of U.S. and Latin American editors was ascertained through a mail survey to

measure respondents' evaluations of the perceived importance of world press problems. Respondents evaluated the importance of a list of world press problems. Questionnaires were mailed to the editorial staffs of two stratified random samples of U.S. daily newspapers -- small- and medium-circulation daily newspapers -- and the population of the largest circulation daily newspapers in each state during December 1986. A follow-up wave was mailed during February 1987. The questionnaires were addressed to the foreign editors listed in the 1986 Editor and Publisher International Yearbook, the most recent edition available at the time of the study. If no foreign editor was listed, the managing editor and editor were chosen in that order.[1] The sample of 50 small newspapers was randomly drawn from daily newspapers with weekday circulations of 50,000 or less. The sample of 50 medium newspapers was randomly drawn from daily newspapers with circulations ranging from 50,000 to 100,000. If the largest circulation newspaper in each state was drawn in these samples, a replacement was selected.

Different circulation U.S. dailies were examined because there was a possibility for expecting differences by circulation. Newspaper editors on small dailies may feel more empathy for some Third World press problems than editors on large dailies, such as empathy for Third World editors' technological disadvantages because they themselves may feel technologically inferior to their large-circulation counterparts. However, editors on large circulation U.S. daily newspapers may have more experience and knowledge with Third World press problems. Large circulation dailies were selected not on circulation alone but the largest circulation newspaper in each state for two reasons: as a practical matter, there are only a handful of very large, prestigous daily newspapers in the United States; and the largest daily newspaper in each state indicates regional prestige and influence.

A random sample of 53 editors from daily newspapers from the Latin American region was also examined. In international politics, the term "region" has a meaning beyond mere geography. A region involves homogeneity, interdependence, common political orientations, institutional membership, and transaction flows, among other things (Ng-Quinn, 1986). Geography, while important, is not absolute. As such, editors on newspapers in South America, Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean were examined.[2] Questionnaires in both English and Spanish were mailed to the editors of the the largest circulation daily newspaper in each nation. In the larger nations -- those with more than 20 newspapers listed in the Yearbook -- a random sample of three of the top 20 circulation dailies was selected. Because these nations have larger populations, greater regional influence, and more media-rich societies, it was felt that newspapers in these nations should receive greater representation in the sample.

If one accepts the premises of the cultural imperialism hypothesis, there is reason to suspect that nations in the Latin American region have been victims of cultural imperialism. Their location so near the United States and the United States' historical claim that Latin American and the Caribbean are in America's sphere of influence make this region a logical choice for study (Beltran, 1975; Fejas, 1983a, 1983b; McNelly, 1979; Morales, 1984; Niblo, 1983; Renaud, 1985). Further, Beltran (1975) observed that Latin America "lies between high and low levels of advancement," falling generally below the standards of the United States, Canada, and Western Europe, but well above most Asian and African nations. For the most part, Latin America comfortably exceeds UNESCO's minimum media availability standards.

Despite these relatively high media standards, news media in Latin America and the Caribbean are highly dependent on the Western news services, technology, advertising investments, and operations. While it could be argued that these factors frustrate Latin American and Caribbean nations, and as a result gatekeepers in these nations may be more likely to subscribe to the developmental concept than U.S. editors, it could also be argued that as victims of media imperialism they are socialized into the Western paradigm and therefore subscribe to the Western press model. It is also important to point out that in addition to these development-related factors, Latin American and Caribbean nations have endured -- and in some parts still endure -- harsh government attempts to quash press freedom (Alisky, 1981; Garrison & Munoz, 1986; Merrill, 1988; Salwen & Garrison, 1988).

It should come as no surprise that surveying Latin American editors was a formidable task. Latin American editors are less familiar with being surveyed for their opinions than U.S. editors. Problems with international mail and the fear of governmental retaliation for the wrong opinions in some cases aggravate the task. In an attempt to overcome these problems, almost half the Latin American respondents who responded to the questionnaire were personally contacted by the authors when they came to the United States for professional activities in Miami, San Antonio, and Vancouver during 1986 and 1987. While this personal method of contacting the Latin American editors increased the response rate, it unfortunately created a bias favoring the large circulation newspapers in the region whose editors frequently attend professional meetings abroad. Only two of the 14 Caribbean editors responded, compared to nine of the 29 South American editors, four of the seven Central American editors, and two of the three Mexican editors.

Editors were asked to evaluate a list of 42 problems facing the world press using a zero to 100 scale, with zero indicating that the matter was not important at all and 100 indicating that it was very important. The items were selected from a review of the literature as well as interviews with U.S. and Latin American/Caribbean journalists during professional meetings. The editors were informed: "We are trying to create an agenda for the most important problems currently facing the world press community." It was emphasized in the cover letter that the editors should evaluate the problems in regard to their importance: "That is, regardless of how you personally feel about these matters, how important do you feel they are as issues worth addressing in some way or another by the world press community?" The purpose of these instructions was to emphasize that we sought evaluations of issue importance, not attitudinal evaluations.

A total of 118 editors responded, an overall response rate of 58 percent. Despite the personal efforts to contact the Latin American editors, only 17 responded (32 percent). Among the U.S. editors, 33 (66 percent) of those from small circulation dailies responded; 30 (60 percent) from medium-size dailies responded; and 38 (76 percent) from large-circulation dailies responded.

Analysis

The items were analyzed using the varimax factor analysis rotation subprogram of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975). The analysis yielded a 12-factor solution that accounted for 79.5 percent of the variance. It is traditional in factor analysis to only examine factors attaining unity (eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater). Only factors with three or more loadings constituted acceptable factors for further analysis (Wimmer & Dominick, 1987, p. 471).

Following criteria set by McCroskey & Jensen (1975), .60 constituted a minimal acceptable loading. The item must also not exceed .40 on another factor.

Table 1 presents the 15 items loading on the first four factors accounting for 51.7 percent of the variance.[3] The fourth factor is being presented with the caveat that only two items met the strict a priori criteria for acceptable loadings. This factor is being presented and analyzed because the two items that loaded on this factor made intuitive sense and the factor attained an acceptable reliability coefficient. Even Wimmer and Dominick (1987, p. 471), who put forth the "general rule" that at least three items should load on a factor, conceded that the three-item criterion is not widely accepted. No factor beyond the first four attained an eigenvalue above 2.0. Also, no factor beyond the first four had more than one item equal to or greater than .60 and less than .40 on another factor. The first three factors each attained high Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .87 to 92.

Table 1 About Here

The six items that cluster on Factor 1 all represent problems dealing with government pressure on the press. The factor represents the hypothesized freedom-of-the-press dimension. The word "government" appears in all items. This factor, which accounts for 29.1 percent of the variance, was labelled the Pressure factor. The four items that cluster on Factor 2, which account for 11.7 percent of the variance, represents the hypothesized development factor. All the items on this factor refer to the "use" of news media for achieving some ostensibly positive social goal, such as boosting democracy or promoting culture. This factor was referred to as the

Development factor. Factor 3, labelled the News factor, which accounts for 6.2 percent of the variance, deals with news coverage of and by developing nations. The two items that load on Factor 4, the Training factor, which accounts for 4.7 percent of the variance, deals with the "training" of journalists. Items loading on these last two factors have traditionally been addressed in discussions of development journalism. Unlike the development factor, however, these last two factors involve less controversial aspects of Third World news grievances. Apparently emphasis on the more controversial dimensions dividing the world press community led us to select conflict-oriented hypotheses.

Table 2 shows the correlation matrix among the four factors. All pairs of factors are significantly correlated. The correlations suggest that the pressure factor is relatively independent of the other factors; while the other factors -- all development-related factors -- share a modest amount of variance. The pressure factor correlates between .18 to .36 with the other factors (3 to 13 percent shared variance). By contrast, the pairs of correlations which do not include the pressure factor account for 21 to 30 percent of the shared variance.

Table 2 About Here

Four separate one-way ANOVAs were computed to determine whether the four groups of gatekeepers varied in their evaluations toward each of the factors. Factor grand means ("GM" in Table 1) were computed using the mean of the means of the items that loaded on the factors. When an ANOVA attained significance at the .05 level, the Scheffe's a posteriori significance matrix was computed to determine which pair or pairs of gatekeeper groups were significantly different from each other at the $p < .05$ level or greater.

The ANOVA on the pressure factor yielded no significance differences ($F = 1.35$, Total df = 108, Between df = 3, Within df = 105, $p < .26$; Group Means: Small, 91.6; Medium, 86.4; Large, 86.9; Latin, 82.8). Given the consistently high evaluations for the pressure factor by all respondents, it appears that all the editors regarded freedom of the press (government pressure on the press) to be an important world press problem. Similarly, no significant differences were found on the news factor ($F = .94$, Total df= 111, Between df = 3, Within df = 107, $p < .43$; Group Means: Small, 50.4; Medium, 61.6; Large, 57.6; Large, 56.8). Significant differences were found in editors' evaluations of development ($F = 5.53$, Total df = 114, Between df = 3, Within df = 111, $p < .01$; Group Means: Small, 50.7; Medium, 41.6; Large, 47.6; Latin, 72.5) and training ($F = 2.93$, Total df = 111; Between df = 3, Within df = 108; $p < .04$; Group Means: Small, 43.4; Medium, 32.7; Large, 44.7; Latin 58.3).

The Scheffe test matrix for the development factor showed Latin American editors evaluated development as significantly more important than all U.S. editors, no matter what the circulations of their newspapers. There were no differences among the groups of U.S. editors, however. The Scheffe matrix for the training factor yielded only one significant pair. The Latin American editors evaluated the training factor as significantly more important than the U.S. editors on medium-size newspapers.

Conclusions

This study found two hypothesized dimensions underlying the plethora of world press problems -- freedom of the press and development. Freedom of the press, as it is usually conceived in the United States, refers to an unfettered, independent press. The press may often be at odds with

authority. According to the Western concept, a critical press serves an important social function by publicly exposing problems so those problems can be addressed. By contrast, according to the developmental concept, the press serves an important social function by actively promoting social and economic development. The two dimensions may be in opposition at times because the first stresses what it regards as the beneficial, self-righting aspects of public discussion of conflict. The latter, however, avoids conflict in favor of social harmony and unity. These dimensions, it was suggested, partly underly the gatekeeping process -- at least as it pertains to international news.

No support was found for the hypothesis that U.S. editors would be more supportive of freedom of the press than Latin American editors. Both the U.S. and Latin American editors believed that a press free of government pressure was important. The hypothesis concerning development was supported. The Latin American editors were more supportive of the developmental concept of the press than the U.S. editors. Latin American editors saw no conflict between supporting a developmental role for the press in society while also supporting the notion of freedom of the press in terms of separation of state and press. It should be noted, however, that none of the items on the development factor mentioned cooperation between a government and the press. Given the ambiguity of the developmental concept, this study suggests that the U.S. and Latin American editors may be interpreting the developmental concept differently.

Two other dimensions found in the analysis -- news coverage of and by developing nations and journalism training -- are usually thought to be consumed under the development dimension. In line with what would be expected from Ghorpade's findings, the U.S. and Latin American editors showed no differences in their evaluations of news coverage of and by

developing nations. There was, however, some evidence for a difference in the training dimension, with the Latin American editors more likely than at least the editors on medium-circulation U.S. newspapers to see training as a serious problem. Too much should not be made of this finding. The finding barely attained statistical significance, and only one group of U.S. editors differed from Latin American editors.

Overall, the findings in this study suggest a surprising degree of agreement between U.S. and Latin American editors. Both groups agree that a press free of government pressure is an important world press problem. Though U.S. and Latin American editors disagree regarding the developmental concept, these differences may be attributable to the ambiguity of the concept. U.S. editors may have implicitely assumed that the developmental concept involves government interference with the press while Latin American editors made no such an assumption. U.S. and Latin American editors both agree that news coverage of and by the Third World needs improvement. And the U.S. and Latin American editors generally agree with the need for improved journalism training in the Third World.

Obviously there is a need to look beyond the gatekeepers in the Latin American region if we are to understand differences as well as similarities in news values and press functions among gatekeepers in different regions. The Latin American region's dependence on the West, its history of press repression, its relative economic strength compared to most Third World nations, and its adoption of a Western press model based on free enterprise suggest possible differences between the Latin American press and, say, the African or Asian press. This study found that U.S gatekeepers hold similar notions of newsworthiness and press functions which did not vary by circulation. This might be expected in a highly developed nation where the

training of journalists has become standardized. Future research should investigate whether gatekeepers in developing nations and regions hold homogeneous views or whether variation exists. Future research should also investigate how Western and Third World gatekeepers interpret the developmental concept.

Footnotes

1. In several cases, the respondents mentioned that they passed the questionnaires on to someone more knowledgeable about such newsroom policies. In one case, the questionnaire was filled out by a committee of newsroom personnel.

2. Cuba was not included in the sample because its unique political and press systems in the region suggests that it may not share the same a high degree of "regionalism" with other Latin American gatekeepers.

3. The other 27 items were: objectivity in news reporting; freedom of the press; concentration of newspaper ownership; the need for more newspapers; reliance of newspapers on news services, syndicates; freedom of information; import taxes on newsprint, ink, equipment; terrorism and violence against journalists; right to reply in newspapers; scholarships and financial assistance; compulsory licensing of journalists; establishment of New World Information Order; excessive taxes on newspapers; awards and honors for professional excellence; use of confidential sources by journalists; lack of competition in the newspaper industry; right of newspapers to refuse advertising; use of news media/world press to promote world peace; physical dangers to journalists in the field; need to disseminate news more rapidly; government reluctance to release information; journalists' right to protect their sources; newspapers' adoption of new technologies; injection of politics in news reporting; portrayal of developing nations in stereotypical fashion; lack of "positive news" about developing nations; unions and other employment problems.

References

Adams, W.C. (1986). Whose lives count? TV coverage of natural disasters. Journal of Communication, 36, 1986, 113-122.

Aggarwala, N.K. (1978). News with third world perspectives: A practical suggestion. In P.C. Horton (Ed.), The third world and press freedom (pp. 197-209) New York: Praeger.

Alisky, M. (1981). Latin America media: Guidance and censorship. Ames: The Iowa State University Press.

Altheide, D. (1984). Media hegemony: A failure of perspective. Public Opinion Quarterly, 48, 476-490.

Altschull, J. H. (1984). Agents of power: The role of the news media in human affairs. New York: Longman.

Atwood, L.E., & Grotta, G.L. (1973). Socialization and news values in beginning reporters. Journalism Quarterly, 50, 759-761.

Atwood, L.E., & Bullion, S.J. (1982). News maps of the world: A view from Asia. In L.E. Atwood, S.J. Bullion, & S. Murphy (Eds.), International perspectives on news (pp. 102-132). Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Beltran, L. (1975, December). Communications research in Latin America. InterMedia, 3, 7-9.

Blanchard, M.A. (1983). The crusade for worldwide freedom of information: American attempts to shape World War II peace treaties. Journalism Quarterly, 60, 583-588.

Breed, W. (1955). Newspaper 'opinion leaders' and processes of standardization. Journalism Quarterly, 32, 277-284.

Budd, R.W. (1964). Attention score: A device for measuring news play. Journalism Quarterly, 41, 259-262.

Bullion, S.J. (1983). Press roles in foreign policy reporting. Gazette, 32, 179-188.

Chaudhary, A. (1974). Comparative news judgment of Indian and American journalists. Gazette, 20, 233-247.

Cutlip, S.M. (1954). Content and flow of AP news from Trunk to TTS to reader. Journalism Quarterly, 31, 434-446.

Editor & Publisher International Yearbook. (1986). New York: Editor & Publisher.

Encanto, G.R. (1982). Development journalism in the Philippines. In L.E. Atwood, S.J. Bullion, & S. Murphy (Eds.), International perspectives on news (pp. 38-48). Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Fejes, F. (1983a). Media imperialism: An assessment. In D. C. Whitney, E. Wartella, & S. Windahl (Eds.), Mass Communication Review Yearbook. Vol 3 (pp. 345-353). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Fejes, F. (1983b). The U.S. in third world communications: Latin America, 1900-1945. Journalism Monographs, No. 86.

Gaddy, G. D., & Tanjong, E. (1986). Earthquake coverage by the Western press. Journal of Communication, 36, 113-122.

Galtung, J., & Ruge, M.H. (1965). The structure of foreign news. Journal of Peace Research, 2, 64-91.

Garrison, B. (1980). The electronic gatekeeper: Editing on the copydesk of a metropolitan newspaper. Newspaper Research Journal, 1, 7-17.

Garrison, B., & Munoz, J.E. (1986). Commentary: The free and not-so-free press of Latin America and the Caribbean. Newspaper Research Journal, 7, 63-69.

Gerbner, G., Marvanyi, G. (1984). The many worlds of the world's press. In G. Gerbner and M. Siefert (Eds.), World communications: A handbook (pp. 92-101). New York: Longman.

Ghorpade, S. (1984). Foreign correspondents and the new world information order. Gazette, 33, 203-208.

Gieber, W. (1956). Across the desk: A study of 16 telegraph editors. Journalism Quarterly, 33, 423-432.

Gold, D., & Simmons, J.L. (1965). News selection patterns among Iowa dailies. Public Opinion Quarterly, 29, 425-430.

Hachten, W.A. (1981). The world news prism: Changing media, clashing ideologies. Ames: The Iowa State University Press.

Hart, J. (1963). The flow of news between the United States and Canada. Journalism Quarterly, 40, 70-74.

Hester, A. (1971). An analysis of news flow from developed and developing nations. Gazette, 17, 29-43.

Hester, A. (1974). The news from Latin America via a world news agency. Gazette, 20, 82-91.

Holmberg, S. (1987). The protection and licensing of journalists: A global debate. International Communication Bulletin, 22, 21-29.

Jeffres, L.W. (1986). Mass media: Processes and effects. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Kaplan, F. (1979). The plight of foreign news in the U.S. mass media. Gazette, 25, 233-243.

Lambert, D. A. (1956). Foreign correspondents covering the United States. Journalism Quarterly, 33, 349-356.

Lippmann, W. (1922). Public opinion. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Masmoudi, M. (1978). The new world information order. Paris: UNESCO International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems.

McCroskey, J. C., Jenson, T.A. (1975). Image of mass media news sources. Journal of Broadcasting, 19, 169-180.

McDaniel, D. (1986). Development news in two Asian nations. Journalism Quarterly, 63, 167-170.

McNelly, J. T. (1979). International news for Latin America. Journal of Communication, 29, 156-163.

McQuail, D. (1984). Mass communication theory: An introduction. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Merrill, J.C. (1988). Inclination to Press Control in Twelve Latin American Nations. Paper presented to the Fifth Annual Intercultural Conference on Latin America and the Caribbean, Miami.

Morales, W.Q. (1984). Latin American news on network TV. Journalism Quarterly, 61, 157-160.

Mowlana, H. (1975). Who covers America? Journal of Communication, 25, 86-91.

Ng-Quinn, M. (1986). The internationalization of the region: The case of Northeast Asian international relations. Review of International Studies, 12, 107-125.

Niblo, S. R. (1983). British propaganda in Mexico during the second world war: The development of cultural imperialism. Latin American Perspectives, 10, 114-121.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. (1975). SPSS: Statistical package for the social science 2nd Ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Ogunade, A. (1973). Mass media and national integration in Nigeria. In L. E. Atwood, S.J. Bullion & S. Murphy (Eds.), International perspectives on news (pp. 22-32). Carbondale and Edwardsville, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Peterson, S. (1979). Foreign news gatekeepers and criteria of newsworthiness. Journalism Quarterly, 56, 116-125.

Renaud, J. (1985). U.S. government assistance to AP's world-wide expansion. Journalism Quarterly, 62, 10-16, 36.

Reyes Matta, F. (1979). The Latin American concept of news. Journal of Communication, 29, 164-171.

Riffe, D., & Shaw, E. (1982). Conflict and consonance: Coverage of the third world in two U.S. newspapers. Journalism Quarterly, 59, 617-626.

Riffe, D., Ellis, B., Rogers, M. K., Van Ommeren, R. L., & Woodman, K. A. (1982). Gatekeeping and the network news mix. Journalism Quarterly, 63, 315-321.

Righter, R. (1979). Whose news? Politics, the press and the third world. New York: Times Books.

Rogers, E. M., & Dearing, J. W. (in press). Agenda-setting research: Where has it been, where is it going? In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), Communication yearbook. Newbury Park: Sage.

Salwen, M. B., & Garrison, B. (1988). U.S. editors' perceptions of world press problems. Paper presented to the fifth annual intercultural conference on Latin America and the Caribbean, Miami, 1988.

Semmel, A. K. (1976). Foreign news in four U.S. elite dailies: Some comparisons. Journalism Quarterly, 53, 732-736.

Sigel, L. Reporters and officials: The organization and politics of newsmaking. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Snider, P. B. (1967). 'Mr. Gates' re-visted: A 1966 version of the 1949 case study. Journalism Quarterly, 44, 419-427.

Stempel, G. H. III. (1985). Gatekeeping: The mix of topics and the selection of stories. Journalism Quarterly, 62, 791-796, 815.

Stone, G. C. (1987). Examining newspapers: What research reveals about America's newspapers. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Sussman, L. (1978). Developmental jcurnalism: The ideological factor. In P.C. Horton (Ed.), The third world and press freedom (pp. 74-92). New York: Praeger.

Weaver, D. H., J. M. Buddenbaum, & Fair, J. E. (1985). Press freedom, media, and development, 1950-1979: A study of 134 nations. Journal of Communication, 35, 104-117.

White, D. M. (1950). The 'gatekeeper': A case study in the selection of news. Journalism Quarterly, 27 383-390.

Whitney, D.C., & Becker, L.B. (1982). Keeping the gates for the gatekeeper: The effects of the wire news. Journalism Quarterly, 59, 60-65.

Wilhoit, G.C., & Weaver, D.H. (1983). Foreign news coverage in two U.S. wire services: An update. Journal of Communication, 33, 132-148.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (1987). Mass media research: An introduction. 2nd Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

TABLE 1

Factor Analysis of first four factors

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	h^2
Government Pressure (GM=86.1)					
--Gags, blackouts on reporting imposed by government (X=83.6, Sd=23.0)	.85	.10	.20	-.02	.90
--Government secrecy (86.5, 18.3)	.82	.11	.10	.12	.72
--Prepublication censorship by government officials (86.6, 20.6)	.79	.06	.27	.05	.78
--Closings of newspapers by governments (80.0, 17.7)	.72	.16	-.04	-.08	.60
--Government control of the press (90.9, 16.8)	.68	.00	.08	-.02	.67
--Government pressure to manipulate the press (89.1, 16.2)	.63	.05	.12	.07	.60
Development (GM=46.1)					
--Use of newspapers to stimulate social development (46.5, 33.4)	.17	.79	.30	.28	.85
--Use of newspapers to stimulate economic development (47.6, 29.0)	.08	.74	.04	.15	.89
--Use of news media to promote national culture (39.8, 28.1)	.05	.70	.22	.06	.71
--Use of news media to boost democracy and pluralism (50.5, 33.5)	.09	.69	.03	.10	.73
News of Developing Nations (GM=57.0)					
--Need for more news about developing nations (59.5, 28.5)	.28	.20	.78	.17	.83
--Lack of news from news services about developing nations (59.1, 29.4)	.26	.16	.76	.03	.85
--Need for news services for developing nations (52.5, 30.4)	.15	.16	.67	.22	.83

Table Continued on Next Page

Training Needs (GM=41.5)					
--Mid-career technical training for journalists (49.5, 33.6)	.07	.29	.12	.71	.69
--Government aid in training journalists (34.5, 33.3)	.04	.15	.16	.71	.68
Factor Eigenvalue	12.23	4.92	2.62	2.18	
Variance Accounted For	29.1%	11.7%	6.2%	4.7%	
Cronbach Alpha	.92	.88	.87	.69	

TABLE 2

Pearson Correlations Among the Factors

FACTOR	Pressure	Development	News	Training
Pressure	------	.26 p < .004	.36 p < .001	.18 p < .030
Development	------	------	.55 p < .001	.52 p < .001
News	------	------	------	.46 p < .001